UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

April 21, 2006

OFFICE OF
SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY
RESPONSE

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: FY 2007 OSWER National Program Guidance

FROM: Susan Parker Bodine / s /
Assistant Administrator

TO: Regional Administrators I-X

I am pleased to transmit the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) FY 2007 national program guidance. This guidance is the result of a multi-year process to align Agency, state, and tribal processes to strengthen our joint strategic planning.

All major OSWER programs and their enforcement counterparts are covered by this guidance. It defines national policy, strategic goals and priority activities for the OSWER programs, as well as the Superfund enforcement component managed by the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA). This guidance is prepared, in part, to implement the *2003-2008 EPA Strategic Plan*[1] and is consistent with the *EPA FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification*[2], and it should be used to assist in National Environmental Performance Partnership System (NEPPS) discussions.

Many of you have contributed to the development of EPA's 2006-2011 Strategic Plan revisions. While these revisions are still under review, the Agency has directed all

[1]The *2003-2008 EPA Strategic Plan* can be found at http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/plan/plan.htm . Waste programs and their enforcement components are contained in goals 3, 4 and 5.
[2] The *EPA FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification* can be found at http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2007/2007cj.htm.

National Program Managers (NPMs) to issue their 2007 guidances under the current 2003-2008 Strategic Plan. However, EPA's Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) has afforded NPMs the flexibility to include new measures in their guidances to communicate their goals and expectations. OSWER has identified newly proposed measures in its guidance and will be working with the Regions on these new measures and FY 2007 commitments.

We are developing outcome-oriented measures to drive our planning and implementation activities. Current efforts to develop measures, such as the outcome measure for sites ready for reuse, are essential in supporting overarching environmental objectives. Looking forward, we are exploring opportunities to measure and communicate our successes consistently across various OSWER program areas. The goal of these efforts is to establish some measures that serve all cleanup programs and are the basis for program evaluation efforts.

This is our sixth national guidance. I would like to congratulate EPA staff and state and tribal counterparts on the considerable efforts undertaken to improve our national planning processes; reduce transaction costs for states, tribes, and EPA; and increase communication and coordination to achieve desired environmental results. Changes from the prior-year guidance include: revised dates and statistics throughout the document, stronger emphasis on results under grant agreements, a synopsis of our feedback process, and the addition of a stand-alone appendix for annual commitment measures.

The following is an overview of FY 2007 priorities for all OSWER and related OECA programs. Additional detail is provided for individual programs in the main section of this guidance.

OVERARCHING PROGRAM PRIORITIES

In recent years, we have focused on a series of initiatives to enhance and strengthen our waste management, response, cleanup and enforcement programs. In FY 2007, waste programs will continue to emphasize these priorities as a means of accomplishing our national objectives. The following objectives characterize EPA's land program activities: Revitalization; Recycling, Waste Minimization and Energy Recovery; Emergency, Preparedness and Response and Homeland Security; and implementation of the recently-authorized Energy Policy Act of 2005.

- Revitalization: The primary goal of the EPA cleanup programs is to restore the nation's contaminated land and enable America's communities to safely return to or continue to use these properties for beneficial economic, ecological, and societal uses. The success of EPA's land revitalization strategy requires the continued commitment by EPA managers and staff to make land revitalization a core component of our cleanup programs and provide continued support for the extensive regional activities already under way. Faster, efficient, and protective cleanups for revitalization will be fostered by 1) ensuring public confidence and protection in site reuse through

developing policies and systems to ensure safe long-term use of remediated land; 2) removing unintended barriers by identifying and addressing barriers that hinder a community's beneficial reuse of contaminated properties; 3) working with the private marketplace by developing tools and information to promote land revitalization; and 4) developing revitalization measures and indicators that can be used by all of our cleanup programs to demonstrate our accomplishments.

- Recycling, Waste Minimization and Energy Recovery: EPA's strategy for reducing waste generation and increasing recycling is based on (1) establishing and expanding partnerships with businesses, industries, states, communities, and consumers; (2) stimulating infrastructure development, environmentally responsible behavior by product manufacturers, users, and disposers ("product stewardship"), and new technologies; and (3) helping businesses, government, institutions, and consumers through education, outreach, training, and technical assistance (http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/index.htm). The Resource Conservation Challenge (http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/conserve/index.htm) is a central component of this strategy.

- Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Homeland Security: EPA works in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and other Federal agencies to deliver assistance to states, local and tribal governments during natural disasters and other major environmental incidents. All releases of chemical, biological and radiological incidents to the environment are addressed through authorities provided in various statutes and in the National Contingency Plan (NCP). EPA also will provide support to the Homeland Security Operations Center, as needed, during a nationally significant incident, including a terrorist event.

- Implementing New Energy and Transportation Legislation: EPA has a critical role in implementing the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Energy Act). The Energy Act substantially overhauls the underground storage tank (UST) release prevention program to minimize future releases from USTs and provides additional emphasis on remediation of leaking USTs, with a particular focus on fuel oxygenates such as methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE).

TRIBAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

OSWER continues to emphasize improvement in tribal program performance. Our primary goal is to complete an OSWER Programs tribal Strategy that defines program priorities and accountability through measurement. In particular, OSWER will focus on the following key areas:

- Enhance effective tribal participation by implementing a new OSWER Tribal framework for tribal consultation and outreach.
- Improve results from tribal training.
- Identify program integration opportunities to streamline tribal involvement and capacity building across our statutory authorities (Resource Conservation and

Recovery Act Subtitles C, D and I; Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act Sections 104 and 128; Oil Pollution Act; and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act). An important component is support for integrated solid waste management planning.

- Develop capacity building tools in the following areas: communication, hazard assessment, resource conservation, risk assessment, and revitalization.
- Improve tribal baseline data for better program decision-making.

INNOVATIONS AND REGIONAL PRIORITIES

OSWER will support innovation and cross-cutting objectives. Through strategic collaborations with industry, academia, non-profit organizations, and various levels of government, EPA is stretching beyond its traditional role as a regulator by embracing new ideas and new ways of doing business. While innovative ideas usually begin as small-scale efforts, many hold promise for broader application leading a shift in thinking from waste management to materials reuse and from abandonment of contaminated lands to land revitalization. In FY2007, we will continue to use the OSWER Innovation Workgroup (IWG) to identify and evaluate new and creative solutions to materials design and reuse, emergency response and preparedness, and land revitalization. (http://www.epa.gov/oswer/iwg/about.htm).

Environmental justice is a priority throughout all of OSWER's waste programs ensuring that environmental impacts are not disparate and people can enjoy healthy and environmentally sound conditions. The waste programs will continue to be in the forefront of EPA's efforts to advance the environmental justice agenda and integrate these concerns into our daily business.

OSWER also will support the Agency's priorities for protecting children and upholding citizens' rights to be knowledgeable about the health of their environment. Efforts in this area include the Environmental Justice Toolkit and Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE). Implemented during FY 2005, CARE is designed to help communities identify and reduce multiple sources of toxics in their environment through cooperative agreements. The Administration has requested additional resources for this program in FY 2007, and Regions should continue their ongoing efforts to promote this program. Information about CARE can be found at http://cfpub.epa.gov/care/.

Implementation of improved technologies is an essential element in achieving efficiencies. Regions, states and tribes are asked to continue promoting the deployment of new, more effective and less costly cleanup technologies. This includes ongoing efforts with stakeholders to identify and overcome barriers to deployment of field analytic and remediation technologies.

We recognize that funding the above areas may necessitate a redirection of resources from other program areas. When Regions redirect resources to meet these

cross-cutting priorities, I request that they contact Renee Wynn, Acting Director of OSWER's Office of Program Management (202-566-1884).

GRANTS MANAGEMENT

As part of the President's FY 2007 budget, OMB included language stating that, "EPA will develop a standardized template that all states will use to develop and submit their State grant agreements." To fulfill this promise, EPA is currently working with its state partners to develop the content and format of the new templates (e.g., identifying environmental results of grants and their connection to the Agency's Strategic Plan/ GPRA architecture) for categorical grants. OSWER's FY 2007 NPM Guidance includes proposed state grant templates for the Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance, Brownfields, and Underground Storage Tanks grant programs.

A significant portion of waste program resources are provided to states, tribes and stakeholders in the form of grants and cooperative agreements. Regions are encouraged to strive for continual improvement of grants management to ensure compliance with national grants management policies related to comprehensive pre-award reviews, competition, post-award monitoring, and to focus on environmental results emphasizing grant work plans that contain outcome-based measures. OSWER is committed to following the Agency's Environmental Results Order that ensures that all EPA assistance agreements are results-oriented and are aligned with the Agency's strategic goals and objectives. Additional information on grants management can be found on the EPA website at http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/management.htm.

The EPA National Environmental Performance Partnership System (NEPPS) has been developed to provide greater flexibility in the implementation of delegated programs. Regions, states and tribes are encouraged to continue to develop and refine performance partnership agreements and grants. The EPA publication, "Performance Partnership Grants for State and Tribal Programs: Interim Guidance," provides initial guidance for this process. Additional information on performance partnership grants can be found on the EPA website at http://www.epa.gov/ocirpage/nepps/pp_grants.htm .

I look forward to working with you to meet the challenges in achieving OSWER's national goals and priorities. Please refer questions regarding our consolidated guidance process to Sue Priftis (202-566-1901) or Howard Rubin (202-566-1899) in OSWER's Office of Program Management.

cc: Assistant Administrators
Deputy Regional Administrators
OSWER Office Directors
Superfund National Program Managers
RCRA Directors
OUST Regional Division Directors
Office of Regional Counsels

OSWER Planning Contacts
Tom Kennedy, ASTSWMO
Tim Titus, ECOS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary: Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)

I. Program Offices

This guidance contains implementation priorities for all major OSWER offices: the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation, the Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office, the Office of Emergency Management, the Office of Brownfields Cleanup and Redevelopment, the Office of Solid Waste and the Office of Underground Storage Tanks. OSWER's enforcement counterparts, principally the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance's (OECA's) Office of Site Remediation Enforcement (OSRE) and Federal Facilities Enforcement Office (FFEO), also are represented in this guidance. Basic approaches remain the same from last year.

II. Introduction/Context

All major OSWER programs and their enforcement counterparts are covered by this guidance. The guidance defines national policy, strategic goals and priority activities for the OSWER programs, as well as the Superfund enforcement component managed by the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA). This guidance is prepared, in part, to implement the *2003-2008 EPA Strategic Plan*[1] and is consistent with the *EPA FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification*[2], it should be used to assist in National Environmental Performance Partnership System (NEPPS) discussions.

Changes from the prior-year guidance include: revised dates and statistics throughout the document; adjusted strategies as a result of the new energy and transportation legislation; inclusion of a brief synopsis of OSWER's feedback process; and further integration of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART) assessments and measures.

III. Program Priorities

The following objectives characterize EPA's land program activities under Goal 3: Revitalization; Recycling, Waste Minimization and Energy Recovery; Emergency, Preparedness and Response and Homeland Security; and implementation of the recently-authorized Energy Policy Act of 2005.

- Revitalization: All of EPA's cleanup programs (Superfund Remedial, Superfund Removal, Superfund Federal Facilities Response, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action, Brownfields, and Underground Storage Tanks) and their partners are taking proactive steps to accommodate and facilitate the cleanup and revitalization of contaminated properties. Revitalizing these once

[1]The *2003-2008 EPA Strategic Plan* can be found at http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/plan/plan.htm Waste programs and their enforcement components are contained in goals 3, 4 and 5.
[2] The *EPA FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification* can be found at http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2007/2007cj.htm .

productive properties can provide numerous positive impacts for communities such as removing blight, satisfying the growing demand for land, helping limit urban sprawl, fostering ecologic habitat enhancements, enabling economic development, and maintaining or improving quality of life. While several of EPA's cleanup programs already have developed the tools to measure revitalization progress, an effort is underway to begin implementing at least one cross-program revitalization measure in FY 2007. This new measure will provide opportunities to capture a broader array of accomplishments resulting from the assessment and cleanup of properties.

- Recycling, Waste Minimization and Energy Recovery: EPA's strategy for reducing waste generation and increasing recycling is based on: (1) establishing and expanding partnerships with businesses, industries, states, communities, and consumers; (2) stimulating infrastructure development, environmentally responsible behavior by product manufacturers, users, and disposers ("product stewardship"), and new technologies; and (3) helping businesses, government, institutions, and consumers through education, outreach, training, and technical assistance.

- Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Homeland Security: EPA has a major role in reducing the risk to human health and the environment posed by accidental or intentional releases of harmful substances and oil. EPA will improve its capability to effectively prepare for and respond to these incidents, working under its statutory authorities and, for incidents of National significance, working closely with other Federal agencies within the National Response Plan (NRP).

- Implementing New Energy and Transportation Legislation: EPA has a critical role in implementing the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Energy Act). The Energy Act substantially overhauls the underground storage tank (UST) release prevention program to minimize future releases from USTs and provide additional emphasis on remediation of leaking USTs, with a particular focus on fuel oxygenates such as methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). EPA is currently developing guidance to meet the requirements of both of these statutes.

IV. Implementation Strategies

The Superfund Remedial Program will focus on cleaning up sites and returning them to beneficial reuse. These goals will be achieved by assessing the worst sites first, ensuring that human exposure to toxic chemicals and migration of contaminated groundwater are under control, selecting final cleanup plans for sites, and completing construction of remedies. States and tribes are key partners in the cleanup of Superfund hazardous waste sites, and Superfund's Regional offices will continue to work closely with these partners in accomplishing key goals and objectives under the EPA FY 2003 - 2008 Strategic Plan.

The Superfund Federal Facilities Response Program will continue to focus on achieving

site construction completions and promoting reuse at Federal facilities listed on the National Priorities List (NPL) and specific Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) bases. Work at these sites will be done collaboratively with our Federal, state, Tribal and local partners as well as affected communities. The Superfund Federal Facility Enforcement Program will continue to use the most appropriate enforcement and compliance tools to address the significant problems at these sites. In addition, the program will try to resolve outstanding site-specific disputes as well as obtain statutorily mandated Interagency Agreements (IAGs)/Federal Facility Agreements (FFAs) at those NPL sites without one. The Superfund Federal Facilities Response and Enforcement Programs will continue working together to ensure that the Federal government addresses its responsibilities at NPL and BRAC sites.

The Superfund Removal and Oil programs will continue to ensure that releases of hazardous substances and oil in the inland zone are appropriately addressed to reduce the threat to human health and the environment. EPA will continue to support local, state and other federal responders at response incidents and direct and/or monitor responses by responsible parties. Federal Preparedness and Homeland Security Programs continue to develop and implement preparedness and response policies to meet Homeland Security requirements, including the NRP, and EPA's National Approach to Response (NAR). Compliance with the Risk Management Plan (RMP) Program will be achieved through inspections, audits and analysis of facilities risk management plans. These data will be utilized to conduct outreach to improve chemical safety.

The Brownfields Program will promote assessment, cleanup, and redevelopment of brownfields; fund grant programs and other research efforts; clarify liability issues; enter into partnerships with local, state and Federal entities; conduct outreach activities; and support brownfields job training programs. In FY 2007, Regions will continue to implement the Brownfields Program; support the national grant competition; emphasize performance and outcome measurement; continue to work with state and Tribal co -implementers of the Brownfields law; provide technical outreach support; and address environmental justice issues.

The RCRA program continues focus on two primary areas for FY 2007. One is the continued existing statutory obligations to ensure the safe management of hazardous and non-hazardous waste and cleaning up hazardous and non-hazardous releases. The other is our emphasis on resource conservation and materials management through voluntary partnerships. Much of this effort toward solid waste and chemicals reduction and recycling is under the Resource Conservation Challenge Program.

The Underground Storage Tank Program will continue to implement the provisions of the Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act of 2005 (USTCA) which was enacted as Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Energy Act requires that EPA and states strengthen tank release and prevention programs through: mandatory inspections every three years; operator training; prohibition of delivery for non-complying facilities; secondary containment or financial responsibility for tank installers; and various compliance reports. The Energy Act imposes very strict deadlines on EPA

and states. EPA is required to develop numerous grant guidelines before the FY 2007 grant cycle and states are required to develop their first new requirements for tank owners by February 2007. EPA must develop guidance that states must adopt, and must develop a strategy for USTs in Indian Country to bring them into compliance and to clean up leaks. EPA is currently working with state, Tribal, and industry partners to develop and implement the various requirements.

Additionally, the Underground Storage Tank Program will continue to reduce the national backlog of confirmed releases yet to be cleaned up. At the end of FY 2005, the backlog of sites requiring remedial action was 119,240 sites, which is an eight percent decrease from FY 2004. EPA will work with the states to complete more cleanups each year thereby reducing the backlog. EPA will assist states and tribes with encouraging owners and operators to properly operate and maintain their underground storage tanks, ensuring owners and operators routinely and correctly monitor all regulated underground storage tanks and piping in accordance with regulations, and developing state programs with sufficient authority and enforcement capabilities to operate in lieu of the Federal program.

V. Progress

Progress tracking will continue as normal, using established data systems (such as CERCLIS and RCRAInfo) and/or manual reporting requirements as outlined in program-specific guidance. Note that the Office of Solid Waste has placed increased emphasis on state/regional planning efforts in their guidance.

EPA and the states are working to establish more outcome related program measures and reporting systems. As new measures are implemented we will need to work closely to ensure timely and accurate reporting. Regions and states are encouraged to continue their review of reporting requirements and to identify areas where greater efficiencies and cost savings may be found.

VI. Program Contacts (staff)

Program/Issue	Contact
General OSWER	Sue Priftis (202) 566-1901
	Howard Rubin (202) 566-1899
Superfund Remedial	Art Flaks (703) 603-9088
	Deanna Moultrie (703) 603-8904
Emergency Management	Lisa Guarneiri (202) 564-7997
	Kim Jennings (202) 564-8211
Brownfields	Jennifer Wilbur (202) 566-2756
	Jennifer Bohman (202) 566-2771
Solid Waste	Wayne Roepe (703) 308-8630
	Angela Talaber (703) 308-1848
Underground Storage Tanks	Sammy Ng (703) 603-7166
	Lynn DePont (703) 603-7148

Program/Issue	Contact
Federal Facilities	Tencil Coffee (703-603-0053)
	Tracey Seymour (703-603-8712)
Tribal	Felicia Wright (202-566-1886)
	Lois Gartner (202-566-0213)
Innovation	Brigid Lowery (202-566-0198)
Revitalization	Cathy Allen (202-566-1039)
	Guy Tomassoni (202-566-1937)

Synopsis of OSWER's Feedback Process

Upon receiving the draft 2007 guidances from the National Program Managers (NPMs), the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) will post them on its internet site and notify its counterparts in the EPA Regional offices. OSWER's Assistant Administrator also will send memoranda to Regional Administrators, with copies to key program, state and Tribal contacts, transmitting OSWER's Draft NPM Guidance for review. The review period lasts approximately one month.

OSWER program office contacts (listed at the end of the guidance's executive summary) work closely with Regional program implementers and will relay any concerns to OSWER's Office of Program Management (OPM). EPA's state and tribal co-implementers and stakeholders may send their comments directly to OSWER's Assistant Administrator or to OCFO management. Regional and stakeholder comments and suggestions will be considered by OSWER for the final draft of the guidance to be released in late-April.

Superfund Remedial and Federal Facilities Response Programs

Goal Three: Preserve and Restore the Land
Subobjective 3.2.2: Clean Up and Reuse Contaminated Land

On December 11, 1980, Congress passed the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA or Superfund), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act in 1986. This important legislation was enacted to fill a major gap in environmental protection. The events at Love Canal, New York, and other sites around the country had shown that wastes buried long ago – and mostly forgotten – could prove to be a serious threat to communities. CERCLA provides the Federal government with the authority to respond to releases and threats of releases of hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants to protect public health and welfare.

EPA, working in collaboration with the states, tribes, and other Federal agencies, manages the Superfund program to clean up abandoned hazardous waste sites and releases. EPA also oversees the implementation of Superfund at National Priorities List (NPL) sites with cleanups led by other Federal agencies. These programs seek to protect human health and the environment and to allow sites to be returned to productive use. Through FY 2005, the Superfund program has:

- assessed over 45,100 sites in conjunction with Federal, state and Tribal partners;
- listed 1,547 final or deleted sites (including 172 Federal facilities);
- approved final cleanup plans at over 1,043 NPL sites;
- begun (but not yet completed) construction at 359 NPL sites; and
- completed construction at 966 NPL sites.

The Agency created the Superfund Federal Facilities Response Program in 1994, and charged the program with the responsibility of overseeing the cleanup and reuse of Federal properties. Across the country, thousands of Federal facilities are contaminated with hazardous waste, unexploded ordnance, radioactive waste, fuels, and a variety of other contaminants. Those facilities include many different types of sites, such as abandoned mines, former nuclear weapons production plants, fuel distribution areas, and landfills. With the enactment of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) legislation, more than 500 major military installations representing the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Logistics Agency were slated for realignment or closure in 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995 and 2005. Under the first four rounds of BRAC, 107 of those sites were identified as requiring accelerated cleanup. EPA is currently evaluating additional cleanup and property transfer requirements for bases closed or realigned in the 2005 round of BRAC. For more information on this program go to http://epa.gov/fedfac/documents/baseclosure.htm .

This guidance provides direction to the Regions to meet the priorities of the Superfund Remedial and Federal Facilities Response Programs. To protect human health and the environment and to address potential barriers to redevelopment, EPA has and will continue to work with states, tribes and other Federal agencies, as appropriate, to:

- Prioritize cleanups based on threats to human health and the environment;

- Expeditiously complete remedial cleanup construction at sites listed on the NPL;
- Promote the reuse and redevelopment of Superfund sites to put them into productive use in communities;
- Provide flexibility to determine which statutory authority is best suited to clean up the site;
- Leverage private party resources by continuing to pursue an "enforcement first" strategy that ensures the responsible parties undertake cleanup at sites with unacceptable human health and ecological risks;
- Compel private parties to pay back Trust Fund money spent to conduct cleanup activities;
- Apply innovative technologies that showcase the latest approaches for site characterization and remediation to achieve cost-effective solutions;
- Enhance collaboration between EPA, states, tribes and local governments to implement the Superfund Remedial and Federal Facilities Response Programs;
- Enhance stakeholder involvement by working with communities surrounding Superfund sites to improve their direct involvement in every phase of the cleanup process;
- Address long-term stewardship needs through the Superfund Response Programs to ensure continued protection of human heath and the environment;
- Enhance public access to information on the status of sites on the NPL and Superfund Alternative Sites (SAS); and,
- Improve data quality by keeping the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) up-to-date and accurate to support program planning and accomplishments reporting.

While conducting these activities to cleanup sites, EPA must ensure that it is meeting the mandate of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) to use resources wisely and achieve program results. To date, EPA has developed seven measures to ascertain how well the Superfund Program is progressing in achieving program results. By 2008, EPA plans to:

- Perform 88,000 health and environmentally based site assessments and make 39,687 final assessment decisions under Superfund (as of the end of FY 2005, 38,603 final decisions have been made) to resolve community concerns on whether these sites require long-term cleanup to protect public health and the environment;
- Control all identified unacceptable human exposures from site contamination to at or below health-based levels for current land and/or ground water use conditions at 1,265 Superfund human exposure sites (as of the end of FY 2005, 1,235 sites have human exposures under control);
- Control the migration of contaminated ground water through engineered remedies or natural processes at 967 Superfund ground water exposure sites (as of the end of FY 2005, 937 sites have ground water migration under control);
- Select final remedies at 1,103 Superfund sites (as of the end of FY 2005, 1,043 sites had final remedies selected[1]);
- Complete construction of remedies at 1,086 Superfund sites (as of the end of FY 2005, 966 sites had completed construction);

[1]There was a correction to the cumulative baseline in FY 2003. It was adjusted from 1103 in FY 2002 to 973 in FY 2003.

- Delete 40 of the 1,239 final NPL sites that require no further response activities to protect human health or the environment;
- Ensure that 90% of the five-year reviews due at Superfund Federal facility sites on the NPL remain protective of human health and the environment or actions are underway to ensure such protectiveness.[2]
- Reach a settlement or take an enforcement action before the start of a remedial action at 95 percent of Superfund sites having viable, liable responsible parties other than the Federal government; and
- Address all Statute of Limitations cases for Superfund sites with unaddressed total past costs equal or greater than $200,000.

The Superfund Remedial and Federal Facilities Response Programs will track these measures for FY 2006-FY 2008. To achieve critical program outputs and goals, these programs will continue to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of their operations. The Superfund Remedial program is currently developing a new Sites Ready for Reuse performance measure. The purpose for this new site-wide measure is to communicate cleanup outcomes to the public, while supporting the Agency's mission of encouraging revitalization. This measure will track NPL sites where construction of the remedy is complete; cleanup goals in the Record of Decision have been achieved such that there are no unacceptable risks associated with current and reasonably anticipated future uses; and all institutional controls required in the Record of Decision have been implemented.

EPA must engage states, tribes, and other Federal agencies in the planning process to achieve program results as measured under GPRA. The Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI), the Office of Site Remediation Enforcement (OSRE), the Federal Facilities Enforcement Office (FFEO), and the Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office (FFRRO) are responsible for overall program planning, including implementing the requirements of GPRA and reporting on Superfund program accomplishments. The Superfund Comprehensive Accomplishments Plan (SCAP) is the process by which the Assistant Administrators for OSWER and OECA, and senior Superfund managers monitor progress towards meeting GPRA annual performance goals. SCAP will continue to be used as a management tool to project and track activities that contribute to these GPRA goals and support resource allocation. Regions should continue to plan and report accomplishments in CERCLIS as they have done traditionally.

In addition to the SCAP, the Superfund Program Implementation Manual (SPIM) is a planning document that defines program management priorities, procedures and practices for the Superfund program. The SPIM describes the relationship between GPRA, EPA's Strategic Plan, and the program's internal processes for setting priorities, tracking and planning performance, and meeting program goals. It establishes the process to track overall program progress through program targets and measures. The SPIM is developed biennially. Revisions to the document are issued during the biennial cycle as needed. Any new measures that are developed will be

[2] The Superfund Federal Facilities Response Program will begin reporting this measure in FY 2007 under the GPRA structure established in the 2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan.

incorporated into the SPIM during the biennial cycle. Regions should continue to use the most current version of the SPIM for instructions on entering data into CERCLIS. See http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/process/spim04.htm .

Strategies to Meet Performance Goals

Regions have flexibility to employ various strategies to meet specific targets. Strategies could include working with the Regional drinking water program to ensure that sites within areas of critical concern (source water protection areas) remain a high priority, implementing the sediment site strategy, issuing Superfund redevelopment grants to communities, completing preliminary re-use assessments to encourage site re-use, or partnering with local universities or other Federal agencies to address issues at specific sites. In addition, regions may also employ the SAS approach which ensures National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) equivalent cleanups without listing a site on the NPL.

EPA will continue to maintain its focus on protection of public health and the environment by completing work at sites in a cost-effective manner. Several cost management measures, such ground water pump and treat optimization, remedy updates and innovative technologies utilization, are in place to ensure that Superfund resources that are expended achieve the maximum effect. In addition, EPA reviews candidates for listing on the NPL to ensure their priority and carefully manages the flow of funds to ongoing activities. Regions must still coordinate with the National Remedy Review Board for certain sites on remedy selection, as appropriate, and the National Risk-Based Prioritization Panel to rank new construction projects for fund-financed remedial action funding. For more information, see http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/reforms/types/cleanup.htm . Regions should follow other program guidance and directives, as appropriate, to conduct activities at Superfund Remedial and Federal facility sites. See http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/index.htm and http://www.epa.gov/fedfac/policy.htm.

Tribal Program

tribes play an important role in helping EPA meet its GPRA goals. EPA relies on a number of tribes to implement the site assessment process on Tribal lands. EPA expects to continue to provide funding, through cooperative agreements, to tribes to carry out this activity. In certain instances, tribes and EPA may enter into cooperative agreements for the Tribe to conduct several types of cleanup activities such as limited removal actions, and support agency agreements for assistance during remedial actions. tribes have distinct roles in the cleanup of Federal Facilities under treaties with the U.S. government. The Superfund Response Programs work with tribes on a government-to-government basis at both the facility level and the national policy-making level. tribes are and should be involved in the cleanup process at Federal facility and private sites that affect them (such as mine cleanups or cleanups on DOE or DoD facilities). This typically occurs through meaningful dialogue that respects the unique needs of each Tribe. EPA Regions should continue to develop partnerships with tribes that will enhance capacity and participation in the

environmental decision-making process.

Annual Workplanning

EPA will continue to follow the annual workplanning procedures that are outlined in the SPIM. Headquarters and Regional offices will work together to develop Regional targets for each fiscal year, with the overall goal of meeting national performance goals that are established in the Strategic Plan. EPA will track progress made on the GPRA measures outlined in the Strategic Plan in the online OCFO commitment system. Any new GPRA measures for Superfund that are developed will be added to the online system.

EPA will continue to track other program measures, such as, but not limited to, Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study (RI/FS) starts, Remedial Design (RD) starts, Remedial Action (RA) starts and Five Year reviews, in CERCLIS. For workplanning, each Region should focus on its own individual pipeline (e.g., whether it needs to focus on final remedy selection or construction completions), the overall goals of the program including GPRA objectives and subobjectives, and how it can achieve its portion of the national effort given proposed resources. Regional workplanning efforts should include those targets that will be met by efforts from the states, tribes, or other Federal agencies. These targets should be factored into the workplanning negotiations between Headquarters and the Regions.

Emergency Response and Prevention Programs

Goal Three: Preserve and Restore the Land
Subobjective 3.2.2: Clean Up and Reuse Contaminated Land

Preparing for and Responding to Emergencies

EPA plays a major role in reducing the risks that accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances and oil pose to human health and the environment. Under the National Response System (NRS), EPA evaluates and responds to thousands of releases annually. The NRS is a multi-agency preparedness and response mechanism that includes the following key components: the National Response Center, the National Response Team (NRT) that is composed of 16 Federal agencies, 13 Regional Response Teams, and Federal On-Scene Coordinators (OSCs). These organizations work with state and local officials to develop and maintain contingency plans that will enable the Nation to respond effectively to hazardous substance and oil emergencies. When an incident occurs, these groups coordinate with the OSC in charge to ensure that all necessary resources, such as personnel and equipment, are available and that containment, cleanup, and disposal activities proceed quickly, efficiently, and effectively.

Local, state, and Tribal agencies are critical elements of the NRS. These groups work with the responsible parties to address the vast majority of oil discharges and hazardous substance releases. EPA's primary role in the NRS is to serve as the Federal OSC for spills and releases in the inland zone. This is a key role, since the Federal response is essentially a safety net to address the incidents that are beyond the capability or otherwise cannot be adequately addressed by the state, Tribal or local agency or responsible party.

In FY 2003, the Agency developed and initiated its National Approach to Response (NAR). NAR is designed to ensure that the Agency is better prepared for large-scale responses such as those to terror attacks. The NAR emphasizes the need to provide the necessary levels and appropriate types of support during responses, and is based on moving toward greater consistency across the Regions in emergency response capabilities. During 2005, EPA focused its efforts on addressing the 12 priority initiatives to support the NAR and appointed a HQ/Regional workgroup to address each. By addressing these priorities, EPA is working toward improving its capability to respond to large-scale incidents such as the World Trade Center, Anthrax attacks, and the Columbia Shuttle recovery, as well as the hundreds of other responses that are conducted each year.

Preparedness on a national level is essential to ensure that emergency responders are able to deal with multiple, large-scale emergencies, including those that may involve chemicals, oil, biological agents, or radiological incidents. Over the next several years, EPA will enhance its core emergency response program to respond quickly and effectively to chemical, oil, biological, and radiological releases. EPA also will improve coordination mechanisms to respond to simultaneous, large-scale national emergencies, including homeland security incidents. The Agency will focus its efforts on Regional

Response Teams and coordination among Regions; health and safety issues, including provision of clothing that protects and identifies responders, training, and exercise; establishment of delegation and warrant authorities; and response readiness, including equipment, transportation, and outreach.

In addition to enhancing its readiness capabilities, EPA will work to improve internal and external coordination and communication mechanisms. For example, as part of the National Incident Coordination Team, EPA will continue to improve its policies, plans, procedures, and decision-making processes for coordinating responses to national emergencies. Under the Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government program, EPA will upgrade and test plans, facilities, training, and equipment to ensure that essential government business can continue during a catastrophic emergency. External communication and coordination is through the National Response Team, with close coordination with the Department of Homeland Security on potential terrorism threats.

EPA will work to improve its capability to respond effectively to incidents that may involve harmful chemical, oil, biological, and radiological substances. The Agency will explore improvements in field and personal protection equipment and response training and exercises; review response data provided in the "after-action" reports prepared by EPA emergency responders following a release; and examine "lessons learned" reports to identify which activities work and which need to be improved. Application of this information and other data will advance the Agency's state-of-the-art emergency response operations.

Since Superfund was enacted, EPA has conducted or led over 8,280 removal response actions. In addition, EPA conducts or oversees about 300 oil spill responses each year.

EPA has enhanced its emergency response and removal capabilities through the development of the Core Emergency Response (Core ER) program. Core ER sets standards to ensure that each Region works toward improving and maintaining an excellent response program. Under GPRA, EPA has set a target to improve the Agency's homeland security and emergency response preparedness by 10% each year, as measured through the Core ER evaluation process, that is based on several key elements to emergency response preparedness, such as: health and safety issues, including provision of clothing that protects and identifies responders, training, and exercises; establishment of delegation and warrant authorities; and response readiness, including equipment, transportation, and outreach. In FY 2005, EPA modified its Core ER to include other areas related to emergency preparedness and response, such as the oil program.

Under GPRA, EPA has been tracking responses to oil discharges and hazardous substance releases. The performance measure for the number of Superfund removal response actions (through FY 2004) was 350 per year and the number of oil spill responses (through FY 2005) was 300 per year. In FY 2005, responded to 260 oil spills. Given the number of oil spills that require EPA's participation fluctuates from year to year, the Agency cannot accurately predict a target for this measure. However, EPA ensured that all oil spills within its jurisdiction were properly evaluated and addressed.

Additionally, EPA has developed new performance measures, through OMB's assessment of the program in FY 2005, which better track environmental progress for the Oil Program.

In FY 2005, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reassessed the Superfund Removal program and assessed, for the first time, the Oil Program using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). The Superfund Removal program received a moderately effective score while the Oil Program received an adequate score. Both programs "passed", but are required to implement several OMB recommendations over the next five years in order to make these programs more efficient and effective, including develop better outcome measures. Those recommendations include:

For the Superfund Removal program:

- Modernize the program's data repository (CERCLIS) to ensure accurate and complete information on program performance and financial management.
- Investigate the feasibility of outcome measures that test the linkage between program activities and impacts on human health and the environment.
- Develop a plan for regular, comprehensive and independent assessments of program performance.

For the Oil Program:

- Develop stronger strategic planning procedures to ensure continuous improvement in the program, including regular procedures that will track and document key decisions and work products.
- Evaluate the data quality of key data sources used by the program to improve the accuracy and reliability of performance information.
- Develop a forum for sharing and implementing best practices among Regional offices that will improve the program's overall performance and efficiency.

Additionally, as a result of the PART process, both the Superfund Removal Program and the Oil Program have new long-term, annual, and efficiency measures for which they must report beginning in FY 2005. Those measures are:

Annual Output Measures:

- Voluntary removal actions overseen by EPA and completed (removal)
- Superfund-lead removal actions completed (removal)
- Compliance rate of inspected facilities subject to Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) regulations (oil)
- Compliance rate of inspected facilities subject to Facility Response Plan (FRP) regulations (oil)
- Long-term Output Measures:
- Total completed voluntary removal actions overseen by EPA (removal)
- Total completed Superfund-lead removal actions (removal)
- Gallons of oil spilled to navigable waters by facilities subject to the FRP regulations (oil)
- Compliance rate to all facilities subject to FRP regulations (oil)

Efficiency Measure:

- Superfund-lead removal actions completed annually per million dollars (removal)
- Gallons of oil spilled to navigable waters per million program dollar spent annually on prevention and preparedness at FRP facilities (oil)

PREVENTION PROGRAM

Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems
Objective 1.4: Reduce Risks at Facilities

The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) was signed into law on October 17, 1986. Title III of this law is the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know (EPCRA), which created requirements for state and local planning and preparedness for chemical emergencies, and public access to information concerning potential chemical hazards. In 1990, section 112(r) of the amended Clean Air Act (CAA) established requirements regarding the prevention and detection of accidental releases of hazardous chemicals. The Risk Management Program (RMP) established under those requirements is an extension of the planning and preparedness programs established under EPCRA. Under the RMP program, facilities that handle quantities of regulated substances are required to develop RMPs and submit them to EPA, state agencies, and local emergency planning committees (LEPCs).

EPA, working with states, tribes, local communities, industry, and other Federal Agencies, oversees these programs with philosophy that:

- operators of facilities who have hazardous chemicals are primarily responsible for the safe handling of those chemicals, and
- State and local governments (as well as the community) play a critical role in risk reduction as well as mitigating the effects of chemical accidents.

In order to continue to assist state and local governments and industry in reducing the risks from chemical accidents or mitigating the effects of those accidents should they take place, EPA will:

- continue to provide guidance, tools, and technical assistance to states, local communities, and industry to better enable them to reduce risk;
- analyze existing RMP data as well as data gathered from audits to understand potential chemical risks and releases; and
- assist states and local communities in understanding how these chemical risks could affect them and how to reduce risk and prepare to address and mitigate risks should a chemical accident occur.

Under GPRA, EPA has set as a strategic target that by 2008, 50% of local communities or LEPCs will have incorporated facility risk information into their emergency

preparedness and community right-to-know programs. EPA will collect information from LEPCs during 2006 to determine the extent to which they have incorporated such facility risk information into their planning and community right-to-know programs. After collecting this baseline data, between FY 2005 and FY 2007, EPA will be collecting this information again from LEPCs to determine changes in the baseline information.

The Clean Air Act requires EPA to establish a system to audit RMPs. The audit system is used to continuously improve the quality of risk management programs, gather information on chemical risks, and check compliance with the requirements, all of which assist in improving RMPs and reducing chemical risks. EPA will be collecting information on the number of desk audits, on-site audits, and/or facility inspections completed each year from FY2005-2007. The performance measure for the number of RMP audits/inspections is 400 per year. In FY 2004, EPA conducted 730 RMP field audits/inspections and in FY 2005, EPA conducted 885 RMP field audits and inspections. In FY 2006, EPA will work to identify improved performance measures for the EPCRA and RMP programs to gain a more complete understanding of improvements in chemical safety resulting from the RMP and EPCRA programs.

Useful Websites:

Office of Emergency Management	http://www.epa.gov/oem
National Response Team (NRT)	http://www.nrt.org
Risk Management Program	http://yosemite.epa.gov/oswer/ceppoweb.nsf/content/RMPS.htm
Oil Spills	http://www.epa.gov/oilspill
Emergency Response	http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/er/

Brownfields Cleanup and Redevelopment Program

Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems
Subobjective 2.3: Assess, Clean up, and Redevelop Brownfields.

Strategic Measure:

- Through 2008, EPA will report the number of brownfield properties assessed and cleaned up. Returning these lands to beneficial reuse will enable the leveraging of $10.2 billion in investments and 33,700 jobs through revitalization efforts.

EPA's Brownfields Program will continue to facilitate the cleanup, redevelopment and restoration of brownfields properties. Under the Brownfields Law (Public Law 107-118, "Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act"[3]), brownfields are defined (with certain exclusions) as real properties, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. Brownfield properties include, for example, abandoned industrial sites, drug labs, mine-scarred land, or sites contaminated with petroleum or petroleum products. Through its Brownfields Program, EPA will continue to provide for the assessment and cleanup of these properties, to leverage redevelopment opportunities, and to help preserve green space, offering combined benefits to local communities.

The Brownfields Law was enacted in 2002, expanding Federal financial assistance for brownfield revitalization by providing grants for assessment, cleanup, and job training. The law also limits the liability of certain contiguous property owners and prospective purchasers of brownfield properties and clarifies innocent landowner defenses to encourage revitalization and reuse of brownfield sites. In addition, the Law provides for the establishment and enhancement of state and Tribal response programs, which play a critical role in the successful cleanup and revitalization of brownfields.

<u>Strategy for Brownfields Assessment, Cleanup, Revolving Loan Fund, and Job Training Grants</u>

EPA will continue to provide assessment, cleanup, revolving loan fund, and job training grants to communities. Brownfields assessment grants provide funding to inventory, characterize, assess, and conduct planning and community involvement activities related to brownfields sites. The brownfields revolving loan fund grants provide funding for a grantee to capitalize a revolving loan and for a grantee to make subgrants to carry out cleanup activities at brownfield sites. Cleanup grants (authorized by the Brownfields law) will fund cleanup activities at brownfield sites owned by grant recipients. EPA also will provide funding to create local environmental job training programs to ensure that the economic benefits derived from brownfield revitalization efforts remain in the

[3] Signed in January 2002, for more information on Public Law 107-118 go to http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/sblrbra.htm .

community.

EPA will publish proposal guidelines, solicit proposals, conduct a national competition, announce, and award assessment, cleanup, revolving loan fund, and job training grants. To ensure a fair selection process, evaluation panels consisting of EPA Regional and Headquarters staff and other Federal agency representatives will assess how well the proposals meet the selection criteria outlined in the statute and the proposal guidelines. Final selections will be made by EPA senior management after considering the ranking of proposals by the evaluation panels. The statute requires that funds be directed to the highest ranking proposals.

Proposal Guidelines for Brownfields Assessment, Revolving Loan Fund and Cleanup Grants are available at http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/applicat.htm .

Proposal Guidelines for Brownfields Job Training Grants are available at http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/applicat.htm .

Following award, EPA will assist grantees in achieving specific objectives as agreed upon in the project work plan. EPA will conduct post award monitoring activities to ensure the successful implementation of projects. Grant terms and conditions require grantees to complete Property Profile Forms or Job Training Forms. Using these forms, EPA will collect information on property acreage, assessment completion date, whether cleanup is necessary, cleanup completion date, leveraged jobs, and leveraged dollars. These data supports the national performance measures. Reporting forms are available at: http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/pubs/rptforms.htm

In FY 2007, EPA Regions will be required to verify data submitted by grantees using the Assessment Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) system. Additionally, the FY 2006 class of grants will able to submit data electronically using the Central Data Exchange (CDX). Grantees that do not have capability for electronic reporting will be able to submit paper forms.

Strategy for State and Tribal Response Programs

EPA will continue to work in partnership with state and Tribal programs to address brownfield properties. The Agency will provide states and tribes with tools, information, and funding they can use to develop response programs that will address environmental assessment, cleanup, characterization, and redevelopment needs at sites contaminated with hazardous wastes and petroleum. The Agency will continue to encourage the empowerment of state, Tribal, and local environmental and economic development officials to oversee brownfield activities and the implementation of local solutions to local problems. EPA will publish an annual guidance regarding the criteria for state funding.

Grant Funding Guidance for State and Tribal Response Programs (CERCLA) Section 128(a) is available at: http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/state_tribal.htm#grant .

Following award, EPA will assist grantees in achieving specific objectives as agreed upon in the project work plan. EPA will conduct post award monitoring activities to ensure the successful implementation of projects. EPA is currently completing an OMB Information Collection Request. Upon approval of this request, grant terms and conditions will be revised so that grantees are required to complete property profile reporting forms. Using these forms, EPA will collect information on property acreage, assessment completion date, whether cleanup is necessary, cleanup completion date, leveraged jobs, and leveraged dollars. These data supports the national performance measures.

In FY 2007, EPA Regions will be required to verify data submitted by grantees using the Assessment Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) system.

RCRA Waste Management Programs

Over the next two years, the RCRA program will have two main areas of focus – safe waste management and resource conservation.

In support of safe waste management, EPA will continue existing program obligations such as ensuring the safe management of hazardous and non-hazardous waste and cleaning up hazardous and non-hazardous releases. The RCRA hazardous waste program is close to completing a major effort to bring corrective action sites under control, and will be focusing on effectively moving these sites toward final cleanup. The hazardous waste program also will be completing the issuance of initial permits to facilities and the number of new facilities needing permits has been decreasing. Therefore, there will be increased emphasis on permit renewals. For both hazardous and non-hazardous wastes, the RCRA program will continue to work with Native American tribes on a government-to-government basis to foster improved practices. The non-hazardous waste program will continue to provide technical assistance to our State partners in areas where particular Agency expertise can be of help such as bioreactor and other landfill technologies, homeland security issues, and disaster waste management.

Under our resource conservation efforts, EPA will continue to focus on effective materials management and increased efforts regarding solid waste and chemicals reduction. Now that the Resource Conservation Challenge (RCC) has taken hold, we will build on successful efforts for attaining the objectives of the 2020 Vision Paper (Beyond RCRA) to reduce the generation of wastes, increase recycling of industrial byproduct materials and municipal solid waste, and look at sustainable use of all resources.

The following information provides strategic targets, direction, and priorities for the FY 2007 operating year and is organized according to the Agency's Strategic Plan subobjectives.

Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration
Subobjective 1.1: Reduce Waste Generation and Increase Recycling

The RCRA program will emphasize its strategy to reduce waste, reduce priority chemicals, and conserve resources. The RCC, one of OSWER's highest priorities, continues to be a principal mechanism for achieving this. Regions will be expected to champion and support the four national focus areas:

1. Recycling of municipal solid waste (MSW);
2. Reuse and recycling of industrial by product materials;
3. Reducing priority chemicals in waste streams (covered under subobjective 5.2.2); and
4. Safe recycling of electronics.

In these key areas, we have identified, or started to identify, targets and measures that will demonstrate the positive benefits of this program: increasing recycling of municipal

solid waste and e-waste, reusing and recycling industrial materials, and reducing priority chemical releases (see specific information under Goal 5, Subobjective 2.2). For more information on the RCC see http://www.epa.gov/rcc. Regions and OSW will continue to work together to determine the best steps to take to divert more materials to recycling.

Achieving a national goal of recycling 35% of municipal solid waste is one of the four key goals of the RCC, as well as the 2008 GPRA goal. To achieve a 35% recycling rate, OSW and Regions are focusing on the largest volume waste streams: paper, organics (food waste and green yard waste), and packaging/containers. In 2007, the Regions will continue to focus resources on one or more of these materials. While the Regions have flexibility to determine which of these materials to focus on, there are existing programs, as well as new collaborative efforts, they should consider. Regions should continue to enroll new partners in both WasteWise and GreenScapes and provide support to existing partners. OSW held a paper stakeholder meeting and is planning a beverage container stakeholder meeting in 2006. These stakeholder meetings are designed to lead toward collaborative efforts for paper and container recycling. As we develop these efforts, OSW will continue to work with Regions to seek input. Regions play a significant role in ensuring the success of any collaborative effort. OSW also will work with the Regions to reinvigorate the recycling message.

Measuring success is a foundation of any credible program. EPA established the 35% national goal and will continue to measure success in reaching this goal at a national level. EPA is proposing a 2011 MSW recycling goal of 40%, as well as a goal for diverting MSW from landfilling. This diversion goal will capture in part, the results of our efforts to reduce waste (i.e., through product redesign or reuse). The Regions agreed to report achievements during FY 2006 and use these reports to identify the best way to demonstrate our contributions in FY 2007. The Regions are expected to continue working with OSW to determine approaches to demonstrating success. OSW also has proposed an efficiency measure for the recycling of municipal solid waste, which is currently under review by OMB.

For industrial materials recycling, the objective is to advance the concept of managing materials in terms of their properties, and not in terms of their pedigree. Industrial materials that would otherwise be wastes have properties that make them valuable resources. Recycling these materials can conserve resources, reduce energy use, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce costs and extend the life of landfills. Initially, the RCC is focusing on three specific industrial materials: coal combustion products (CCPs), foundry sands, and construction and demolition (C&D) debris. EPA is proposing two goals for 2011: 1) Increase the use of coal combustion ash to 50%, and 2) Increase the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition debris to 65%. Regions have developed very good working relationships with State counterparts and should continue to foster collaborative efforts with States to share information and data and to coordinate among the State programs. Regions should continue efforts to increase the amounts of these materials that are beneficially used in an environmentally sound manner. To reach these objectives, Regions should particularly focus on two programs: 1) the Industrial Materials Construction Initiative, because it serves as a venue for fostering recycling of

all three focus materials (CCPs, foundry sands, and C&D debris) and 2) the Coal Combustion Products Partnership (C2P2), because it addresses a particularly large quantity material stream.

To contribute to the Construction Initiative, Regions are asked to identify significant upcoming construction projects and encourage the wider use of CCPs, foundry sands, and C&D debris in those projects. Regions should seek opportunities to foster increased use of industrial materials in construction, targeting project developers and those who influence materials use. Regions should document construction project case studies to capture and share the knowledge gained and lessons learned, including challenges to beneficial use and how those challenges are overcome. Regions can then apply the case-study information in marketing the concept to other projects. Effective case studies should include the amount of material used/reused/recycled, as well as energy savings, greenhouse gas reductions, and cost savings.

Regions should work to expand the Coal Combustion Products Partnership (C2P2) and encourage the beneficial use of CCPs. Actions include nurturing the current membership, recruiting new members to the partnership, creating case-studies of CCPs put to beneficial use, and working with state agencies to put CCPs to use in transportation and building projects. Speculation on potential future regulatory impacts has raised concerns about CCP characteristics. Regions and OSW will jointly seek to alleviate such concerns with assistance from experts within the Agency, other agencies, industry, and academia.

In December 2005, OSW held a foundry sands stakeholder meeting in which several Regions participated along with representatives from industries, government agencies, and academia. Stakeholders identified specific action items to help move more sand to recycling, and they committed to collaborative efforts on the actions. OSW and the Regions will work together to follow up on these action items, including coordination of State beneficial use programs and assistance with data collection and management.

The RCC national electronics program focuses on three main goals: environmental design and procurement, operation and maintenance (extending product life), and recycling. Together with the Regions, we have developed several programs which address these goals. OSWER and the Regions will continue to expand our voluntary partnership program, Plug-In To eCycling, increasing on a yearly basis the pounds of electronics recycled nationwide and strengthening our outreach for recycling of electronics equipment. Supporting the Federal Electronics Challenge and encouraging widespread use of the EPEAT tool are also hallmark components of the RCC Electronics program.

OSWER continues to support Performance Track (http://www.epa.gov/performancetrack), an Agency-wide priority innovation program that recognizes and rewards private and public facilities that demonstrate top environmental performance. OSWER has worked with OPEI to develop RCRA incentives (http://www.epa.gov/performancetrack/benefits/regadmin/waste.htm) for member facilities. RCRA Programs are encouraged promote adoption of these incentives

by the states and assist in their implementation. In FY 2006, OSWER collaborated with Performance Track to promote voluntary priority chemical reductions as an important commitment to continuous environmental improvement. Specifically OSWER's National Partnership for Environmental Priorities, a voluntary program that targets priority chemical reduction has worked with Performance track to form the National Challenge Commitment for Priority Chemicals. Under this challenge, Performance Track members declaring a 10% reduction goal for one or more Priority Chemicals can use that single goal to count as two of four goals needed to demonstrate continuous environmental improvement over a three year period.

Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration
Subobjective 1.2: Manage Hazardous Wastes and Petroleum Products Properly

The strategic target for permitting or other approved controls is 95% for 2008. In 2007, Regions are expected to meet the annual goal of 2.4% of the universe. Since all but two states are authorized to issue permits, and because states receive grant funds to implement the RCRA hazardous waste program, Regions must work with states to:

- Develop and implement multi-year strategies to meet the annual goals.
- Identify what is needed for each facility to achieve approved controls and determine when each facility is projected to achieve approved controls.

To meet the FY 2008 strategic target of updating controls to prevent releases at the approximately 150 facilities due for permit renewal by the end of 2006, Regions should work with states to develop and implement multi-year strategies to implement updated controls.

In 2004, OMB assessed the RCRA Base Program, Permits and Grants under the PART, which is used to determine the effectiveness of federal programs. As part of that process, an Efficiency Measure was developed. That measure will be first calculated and reported for Fiscal Year 2006, when information on: (1) total facilities under control and (2) permit costs and base program appropriations will be compiled.

Regions will support and work closely with States to ensure that environmental regulations, applicable federal environmental justice (EJ) policies, strategies, tools and training programs are used to adequately address EJ concerns. Progress towards RCRA GPRA goals in potential EJ communities should advance at least at the same pace as in non EJ areas.

More information on approved controls for the permitting program is at http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/permit/pgprarpt.htm .

Tribal Programs

EPA has important responsibilities relating to safe waste management in Indian country. Regions with Federally recognized tribes are expected to devote resources to assisting

tribes, consistent with the Regional Tribal Waste Management Strategy (June 17, 2005). EPA is developing several program measures to track progress, and Regions will be expected to continue to:

- Increase the number of tribes covered by an integrated waste management plan approved by an appropriate governing body,
- Increase the number of open dumps in Indian Country and other Tribal Lands that are closed, cleaned up, or upgraded.

Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration
Subobjective 2.2: Clean Up and Reuse Contaminated Land

Substantial progress towards achieving the 2008 GPRA goals is the highest priority of the RCRA corrective action program for FY 2007. The 2008 GPRA goals, which build on the success achieved in 2006, are as follows:

- Assess 100 percent of RCRA baseline facilities (assess means that enough information to rank the site has been gathered).
- Control all identified unacceptable human exposures from site contamination to health-based levels for current land and/or ground-water use conditions at 95 percent of RCRA baseline facilities.
- Control the migration of contaminated ground water at 80 percent of RCRA baseline facilities.
- Select final remedies (cleanup targets) at 30 percent of RCRA baseline facilities.
- Complete construction of remedies at 20 percent of RCRA baseline facilities.

These 2008 national goals are based on a revised corrective action baseline (or universe) of 1,968 facilities that was developed in FY 2004 (herein referred to as the "2008 baseline"). National FY 2007 GPRA goals have been established for each Region based on Regional commitments (see chart below). These are the goals that EPA committed to in the FY 2007 President's Budget.

President's Budget Commitments

Region	GPRA Baseline Facilities	Site Assessment Annual Goal	Human Exposure Annual Goal	Groundwater Annual Goal	Remedy Select Annual Goal	Construction Complete Annual Goal
1	190	0	15	18	7	6
2	164	0	10	13	10	6
3	289	0	1	4	5	4
4	308	0	20	14	9	7
5	399	0	36	32	15	15
6	233	0	3	2	6	3
7	109	0	3	3	3	3
8	60	0	0	0	3	3
9	164	0	5	11	7	3
10	52	0	0	1	1	1
Total	1968	0	93	98	66	51

Each Region should work with states to update their strategies to achieve their 2007 and 2008 GPRA goals. The strategies should be facility-specific, and should describe how available resources will be used to achieve the goals. The strategy should include plans for frequent contact with states to discuss their progress in meeting the 2007 and 2008 goals.

The annual target for increasing the efficiency of the RCRA Corrective Action Program is three percent. Each region should work with their states to increase the number of final remedy components constructed during 2007 and future years by three percent per year, presuming that costs remain constant. The number of final remedy components constructed will be measured from RCRA Info as the total number of area-specific and facility-wide construction completions (CA550) completed during 2007.

Regions will support and work closely with their states to ensure that environmental regulations, applicable federal environmental justice (EJ) policies, strategies, tools and training programs are used to adequately address EJ concerns. Progress towards RCRA GPRA goals in potential EJ communities should advance at least at the same pace as in non EJ areas. Regions should work with their states to help develop and offer innovative approaches that will empower citizens' groups to ensure successful voluntary cleanups.

Goal 5: Compliance and Environmental Stewardship
Subobjective 2.2: Prevent Pollution and Promote Environmental Stewardship by Business

Priority Chemical Reductions:

The National Partnership for Environmental Priorities (NPEP) is a part of the Agency's multi-media Resource Conservation Challenge (RCC). The strategic goal is a 10% reduction by 2008 from 2001 levels of priority chemicals in waste. In FY 2007, EPA will achieve NPEP priority chemical reduction goals by identifying for partnership and enrolling the individual facilities, and when possible multiple facilities in industrial and manufacturing sectors, which are responsible for the highest volume of priority chemicals released to the environment. Partners enrolled by Regional and state representatives will contribute to the national priority chemical goal and may contribute to additional Regional or state specific chemical reduction goals. Decisions regarding chemicals (in addition to the 31 priority chemicals) selected for reduction should be based on the chemical waste minimization potential, risk, and generation trends as well as volume of chemical released to the environment. Information on the specific actions and means by which reductions are achieved is provided in the RCC Priority Chemical Action Plan. At this time there are no specific GPRA goals associated with the identification of other chemicals of national concern.

Based on targeting information provided by OSW, and other available information, Regions will establish specific annual Regional reduction goals, identifying the number of pounds of reductions the Region will seek to achieve each year to reach the 2008 Priority Chemical GPRA goal (10% reduction nationally based on 2001 release data from

TRI). Regional annual priority chemical reduction targets will be entered into the Annual Commitment System. Regions will develop a 2007 Regional priority chemical reduction plan designed to achieve these goals, which, at minimum, will describe its goals for recruiting partners for enrollment in NPEP and other partnerships or programs which result in priority chemical reductions. In particular, we hope to recruit partners into NPEP who will provide the greatest contribution toward achievement of the national GPRA goal. Contributions toward the GPRA goal can be achieved by recruiting several small generators as well as by targeting large volume generators.

OSW will also identify priority chemical facilities which are located in, or proximate to, "CARE communities" (for further information on EPA's CARE program see: http://cfpub.epa.gov/care/. Regions will work to recruit a minimum of one of these facilities (beginning with the highest volume priority chemical facility) per Region into NPEP annually.

For further information, see http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/minimize/index.htm.

Program element priority:

- Measurable reduction of priority chemicals released to the environment.

Note that overall program success is measured by reduction in the volume of priority chemicals, rather than the number of facilities enrolled in the partnership program. Additionally, source reduction is the preferred means of chemical reduction, but recycling is an acceptable alternative when viable source reductions options have been eliminated. EPA currently uses the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) and Biennial Reporting (BR) data to measure progress toward GPRA goal achievement.

End Use Energy

In 2005 OSW began to inventory end use energy actions underway in Regional Offices. In 2006 that inventory will be completed and used to develop a national end use energy strategy. The purpose of the national end use energy strategy is to develop a national program which will result in converting to energy those wastes for which pollution prevention options have not been successfully identified. Using the inventory of ongoing Regional actions, OSW will begin work in 2006 with Regions to identify those end use energy actions which may be most promising in terms of delivering results for potential expansion to the national level.

Underground Storage Tanks Program

Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration
Objective 1: Preserve Land (UST)
Objective 2: Restore Land (LUST)

In addition to activities described in previous National Program Guidance, EPA regional offices are responsible for working cooperatively with states to implement the provisions of the Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act of 2005 (USTCA) which was enacted as Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Regions are also responsible for negotiating the terms and amounts of:

1) Underground Storage Tanks (UST) program grants authorized by Section 2007(f)(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (SWDA) and certain provisions of the USTCA and funded with State and Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG) appropriations, and

2) State Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) cooperative agreements authorized by Section 9003(h)(7) and funded by LUST appropriations, and

3) UST and LUST assistance agreements to tribes authorized by PL 105-276 and funded by STAG and LUST appropriations, and

4) Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements authorized in EPA's annual appropriations and funded by STAG appropriations.

Regional offices also directly implement and enforce UST regulations in Indian Country and, to a limited extent, they supplement state activities in areas that are under state jurisdiction.

1. National Priorities

A. ***Cross Cutting Initiatives***

- *Implement USTCA:* Key objectives will be developed in FY 2006.

- *Conduct Enhanced Program Evaluations*: Key objectives include: (1) continuing to provide analytical reports that track national and Regional program performance; (2) improving data quality; (3) examining viability and identifying ways to improve underground storage tank financial assurance mechanisms, including state cleanup funds, (4) conducting evaluations of specific state cleanup workloads to determine strategies for expediting and improving state cleanups programs; (5) developing methods to explicitly highlight the environmental and public health outcomes and benefits of completing LUST cleanups; and (6) continued participation in advancing OSWER's Revitalization Initiative including leading EPA-state efforts to evaluate the need for vapor intrusion guidance

for petroleum sites, and participating in cross-media task forces on ground water and long-term stewardship.

- *Funding and Oversight:* Key objectives will be developed in FY 2006.

- *Fostering and Expanding Partnerships*: Key objectives include: (1) fostering existing partnerships among EPA (headquarters and Regions), states, communities, tribes and industry to prevent releases and clean them up quickly when they occur; and (2) expanding partnerships by including non-OSWER EPA offices and the UST/LUST Regional program offices to achieve an integrated approach on tank issues (e.g., vapor issues and source water issues.) See http://www.epa.gov/OUST/swaustmemo.pdf .

B. *Program Specific Initiatives*

Improving Compliance: Key objectives will be developed in FY 2006. It should be noted that the USTCA imposed a number of conditions on States receiving LUST funding. The key objectives will include what EPA has to do under the law to implement these conditions (e.g., issuing guidelines).

- *Reducing the Cleanup Backlog*: Key objectives include: (1) piloting innovative and cost-effective approaches (such as the use of multi-site cleanup agreements) for cleanup resulting from the cleanup workload study; (2) expanding efforts to optimize cleanups of difficult sites; (3) providing technical and financial assistance to address fuel additives including oxygenates, MTBE, and lead scavengers; and (4) achieving a better understanding of the current backlog of sites and remaining administrative legal and technical impediments to cleanup.

- *Promoting Redevelopment of Abandoned Gas Stations*: Key objectives include: (1) working with Brownfields and OSWER Revitalization programs as key participants in implementing the petroleum provision of the Brownfields law, (2) working to increase state tank program participation in revitalization of petroleum contaminated sites; and (3) identify lessons learned from EPA's investment in USTfields pilots.

C. *Program Development*

In FY 2005, a new LUST measure was reported internally which supports OSWER's approach to revitalization. The new internal measure, acres available for reuse or in continued use at LUST sites, is based on the number of sites at which cleanups are completed each year, multiplied by an estimated average of one acre per LUST site. Total acres also include contaminated land that was abandoned, cleaned up and made available for development. Specific measurements are not currently reported for land that remains in continued use during cleanup, and for abandoned land that is available for reuse. This measure

was a joint effort with the Regional and state LUST programs. See http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/plan/2003sp.pdf .

One of the influences in program development is the Federal government's program assessment rating tool (PART). The PART was developed to assess and improve program performance so that the Federal government can achieve better results. The LUST program was reviewed to identify its strengths and weaknesses to make the program more effective. In FY 2004, the LUST Program received a final numerical score of 68 and an overall rating of "adequate" from OMB's PART review. To achieve this rating, the LUST Program created two long-term performance measures that focus on environmental outcomes. The first measure is to increase the number of sites that meet risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration (tracked as cleanups completed). This measure focuses on the LUST program's sole mission, which is to cleanup LUST sites, and is correlated with the annual performance goal of LUST cleanups completed. This measure tracks EPA's performance on overseeing cleanups performed largely by states. The second long-term measure is to increase the number of sites that meet risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration in Indian Country (tracked as cleanups completed in Indian Country and is subset of the first measure).

The LUST Program developed a measure of program efficiency in FY 2004 that will compare LUST cleanups completed over a 3-year rolling average with public and private sector cleanup costs. In FY 2006, the LUST program will determine whether this efficiency measure results in a meaningful measure of efficiency or whether a new one needs to be developed.

The UST program will undergo a PART review in FY06, with the results to be released in the FY 2008 President's budget request.

2. Funding

EPA provides funds to help states implement their programs through grants or cooperative agreements under the authorities and appropriations described above, and when funding is available, from EPA's Headquarters' EPM and LUST Extramural Operating Plan resources. Specific activities eligible for funding are determined through negotiations between the states and tribes and the EPA Regional offices based on national guidance issued by OUST for implementation of the USTCA. In FY2007, state and tribal cooperative agreements funded with LUST appropriations may only be used for leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by Section 9003(h)(7) of the SWDA. Any financial assistance the Agency provides with LUST appropriations under Section 8001 of the SWDA must directly support state and tribal oversight and cleanup of LUST sites under Section 9003(h) of the SWDA.

A. UST State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) Program

The primary funding authorities for EPA to provide STAG funds to assist state and tribal prevention and detection programs will remain Section 2007(f)(2) of the SWDA for states and Public Law 105-276 for tribes. However, under the President's FY2007 Budget Request, EPA will also have authority to make grants or cooperative agreements for new activities authorized by the Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act of 2005 (USTCA) which was enacted as Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. EPA will not use STAG funds for leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities that are authorized by section 205 of Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, even if those activities are also authorized by the USTCA. Prior to the FY2007 funding cycle, OUST will provide more detailed guidance to the Regions on what prevention and detection activities are eligible for funding with STAG funds in light of the new authorities provide by the USTCA.

States must match funds equal to 25% of their UST program Section 2007(f) grant awards. See http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/cfda.htm (66.804). State matches may include in-kind contributions. In FY2007, EPA may consider granting case-by-case deviations from the 25% State match requirement in 40 CFR 35.335. There is no match requirement for grants to tribes under PL 105-276. To assist the Regional offices in evaluating state and tribal programs and identifying opportunities for improvement, states and tribes need to provide a complete picture of their UST program activities and funding.

EPA and the States must develop and implement systems to track the uses of the STAG funds.

B. LUST Trust Fund Cooperative Agreements

Funds from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund appropriation can only be used for those activities that are authorized by Section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. Consequently, EPA awards cooperative agreements to states under authority of Section 9003(h)(7) of the SWDA. Under Public Law 105-276, Congress authorized EPA to use LUST Trust Fund appropriations to award cooperative agreements to tribes for the same purposes as those set forth in Section 9003(h)(7). Policies and procedures applicable to EPA-State LUST Trust Fund cooperative agreements are presented in detail in OSWER Directive 9650.10A, issued May 24, 1994. See http://www.epa.gov/OUST/directiv/d965010a.htm .

Funds for state cooperative agreements are distributed annually among the Regional offices based on a formula that calculates: (1) a base allocation;

(2) bonuses and rewards marking progress toward State Program Approval (SPA); (3) a performance-based bonus pool for states that are either initiating or completing a higher percentage of cleanups than the national average; and (4) a need allocation. Regional offices are free to reallocate the funds among states and territories based on a closer assessment of their needs in meeting or exceeding the cleanup GPRA measure, and other relevant factors.

EPA allocates LUST funding to tribes on a case-by-case basis that takes into account primarily the tribe's funding needs.

A ten (10) percent state cost share is required. There is no match requirement for cooperative agreements to tribes under PL-105-276. See http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/cfda.htm (66.805).

C. EPA's EPM and LUST Extramural Operating Plan Projects (Subject to availability of funds)

EPM and LUST Extramural Projects are aimed at helping states correct specific deficiencies or make specific improvements in their UST/LUST programs. When funding is available, Regional offices receive funding from OUST's EPM and/or LUST Extramural budget. Within the limitations imposed by the EPA budget and appropriations structure, Regional offices are able to support projects through cooperative agreements, grants, or by obtaining contractor assistance to help states with a specific project.

Regional offices have discretion to decide which state projects to support, but all projects must be strategically important to state UST/LUST programs and OUST's national priorities.

D. Grants to Tribes - PL 105-276

In FY 1999, through PL 105-276, Congress gave EPA authority to provide assistance agreements to Federally-recognized tribes. In general, such assistance agreements can be used for the same purposes for tribes as they are used for states. However, EPA does not have authority under RCRA to approve Tribal programs to operate in lieu of the Federal program.

Grants may be used to help tribes develop the capability to administer their own UST and LUST programs. Examples of eligible projects include the development and implementation of a regulatory program in Indian Country, conducting an unregistered tank survey, and providing leak detection and installer training.

4. Regional Coordination

Regional Planning Meetings, annual Regional Division Directors' meetings, and regularly scheduled monthly conference calls between OUST and the Regional UST/LUST Program Managers provide opportunities for OUST and Regional management to assess the strengths and weaknesses of state programs and decide where EPA's support is most needed and would be most productive. OUST will hold additional Regional Planning Meetings, as needed.

5. State Reporting Requirements and Schedule

Mid-Year Performance Data

States must report Mid-Year performance data on or before April 5 of each year. Regional offices must report to OUST the states' Mid-Year performance data on or before April 10 of each year.

End-of-Year Performance Data

States must report to the Regional offices estimated End-of-Year performance data on or before September 7 of each year. Regional offices must report to OUST the estimated End-of-Year performance data by September 14 of each year. States must report final End-of-Year performance data on or before October 1of each year. Regional offices must report to OUST final Regional offices End-of-Year performance data on or before October 10.

The FY 2007 National GPRA Goal for Cleanups Completed is 13,000. The FY 2006 National GPRA Goal for Cleanups Completed is 13,600. At the end of FY 2005, states and Regional offices reported a baseline of 66% for the percent of UST facilities that are in significant operational compliance with both release detection and release prevention (spill, overfill, and corrosion protection) requirements. OUST's goal for each of the next four years is to increase compliance by one percent (1%) each year.

Regional offices are expected to verify the accuracy and completeness of data provided by states. Verification must be an ongoing process, in order to avoid "last minute" reviews, each time states submit data. Regional offices must either develop their own verification processes or follow verification guidance provided by OUST; in general, such processes should involve sufficient interaction with states that the Regional offices can be confident that the data submitted at the end of each reporting period are complete, up-to-date, and accurate. Each Regional office should conduct at least one on-site review of each state's data. In addition, regional offices are held accountable for working with states to improve their data systems where appropriate.

OSWER NATIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER GUIDANCE
GRANTS MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES
FOR FY 2007

OSWER places a high priority on continuous promotion of accountable and effective grants management in the solicitation, selection, award, and administration of assistance agreements in support of OSWER's mission. The following key areas will be emphasized as we implement our grant programs:

1. Standardizing the timing of issuance of grants guidance for categorical grants (i.e., by April of the fiscal year prior to the year in which the guidance applies);
2. Ensuring effective management through emphasis on training and accountability standards for Project Officers and their managers; and
3. Utilizing new state grant templates to link grants performance to the achievement of environmental results as detailed in the Agency's Strategic Plan and the OSWER National Program Manager Guidance.

The Office of Grants and Debarment (OGD), in its efforts to strengthen the management and oversight of Agency assistance agreements, issued a *"Grants Management Plan for 2003-2008."* The plan is designed to help ensure grant programs meet the highest management and fiduciary standards and further the Agency's mission of protecting human health and the environment. The plan highlights five grants management goals:

1. Enhance the skills of EPA personnel involved in grants management;
2. Promote competition in the award of grants;
3. Leverage technology to improve program performance;
4. Strengthen EPA oversight of grants; and
5. Support identifying and realizing environmental outcomes.

OSWER is committed to cooperating with OGD in accomplishing these goals and continues to work to promote effective and accountable grants management.

Timing of Guidance Issued for Categorical Grants

One of OSWER's objectives is to organize and coordinate the issuance of draft and final guidance documents, including grants guidance, to coincide as much as possible with State, tribal, and regional planning processes. As a result, all guidance packages for categorical grant programs are to be issued by April of the year in advance of the fiscal year of availability of funds if at all possible (i.e., guidance for fiscal year 2007 appropriated funds needs to be issued by April 2006). Not all categorical grant programs issue annual guidance. These programs may simply indicate that they are continuing to use their current guidance.

Effective Grants Management

OSWER's Acquisition and Resources Management Staff (ARMS) serves as liaison to OGD and the first resource for Project Officers and their managers in disseminating, implementing, and ensuring compliance with EPA new and existing grants management policies and procedures. ARMS also serves as the primary point of contact in consultations with our regional offices and Grant Coordinators Workgroup.

ARMS central coordinating role serves to ensure consistent implementation and compliance with Agency grants management policies and procedures throughout OSWER Headquarters and regional program offices. ARMS activities lessen the need for individual project officer discretion in interpreting regulations and facilitate uniform application of these requirements. This enables OSWER project officers to focus on how best to properly manage assistance agreements to meet program goals and objectives.

ARMS provides training, on an as-needed basis, and strongly encourages OSWER Grant Coordinators, Project Officers, and their managers to participate in training which addresses the core competency areas identified in the Agency's *Long-Term Grants Management Training Plan*.

Promoting Competition

OSWER places great importance on assuring that, to the maximum extent possible, all discretionary funding opportunities are awarded in a fair and open competitive environment and that no applicant receives an unfair advantage. OSWER Project Officers must ensure that these actions are fully compliant with EPA Order 5700.5A1, *Policy for Competition of Assistance Agreements* in the solicitation, selection, and award of assistance agreements.

The competition policy, effective January 15, 2005, applies to:

1. competitive announcements issued, released, or posted after January 14, 2005;
2. assistance agreement competitions, awards, and disputes based on competitive announcements issued, released, or posted after January 14, 2005;
3. non-competitive awards resulting from non-competitive funding recommendations submitted to a Grants Management Office after January 14, 2005; and
4. assistance agreement amendments issued after January 14, 2005.

For each competitive funding opportunity announcement, OSWER's Senior Resource Official certifies that the expected outcomes from the awards are appropriate and in support of program goals and, that the announcement is written in a manner to promote competition to the maximum extent practicable.

In accordance with Agency policy, all OSWER competitive funding opportunity announcement are advertised by posting to http://Grants.gov, the central Federal electronic portal for applying for grant opportunities.

Ensuring Effective Oversight of Assistance Agreements

Each year, OSWER develops a *Post-Award Management Plan* which presents our strategy for ensuring proper oversight and management of assistance agreements, specifically, grants and cooperative agreements. The plan, developed in accordance with EPA Order 5700.6 A1, *"Policy on Compliance, Review and Monitoring,"* establishes baseline monitoring requirements for all OSWER grants and cooperative agreements and defines the responsibilities of OSWER managers for post-award monitoring of assistance agreements. The plan does not apply to OSWER regional grants or cooperative agreements, nor does it include requirements for Interagency Agreements (IAGs).

Monitoring activities ensure satisfaction of five core areas:

1. Compliance with all programmatic terms and conditions;
2. Correlation of the recipient's work plan/application and actual progress under the award;
3. Availability of funds to complete the project;
4. Proper management of and accounting for equipment purchased under the award; and
5. Compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements of the program.

Baseline monitoring activities are conducted by Project Officers on every assistance agreement award issued through OSWER program offices. Project Officers are responsible for conducting baseline monitoring on an ongoing basis throughout the life of each agreement. The objective is to keep track of progress on the assistance agreement, ensuring that each recipient maintains compliance with all terms and conditions of the award, including financial and programmatic conditions.

Annually, OSWER conducts Advanced Monitoring Activities (including both on-site and off-site evaluative reviews) on a minimum of 10 percent of our assistance agreement recipients. The reviews are conducted using the "Desk and Off-site Review Protocol" and "On-Site Review Protocol" guidance offered in EPA Order 5700.6 A1. Project Officers are required to submit reports of the reviews, in the "Required Format for Writing a Programmatic Review Report for On-site and Off-site Evaluative Reviews," within 60 calendar days of completion of the evaluation.

OSWER continually stresses the importance of Project Officer's timely submission of evaluative reviews into the Grantee Compliance Database. Implementation of EPA Order 5700.8, *"EPA Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards,"* effective March 31, 2005, further highlights the necessity of timely submission. Under the Order, Project Officers are required to assess the programmatic capability of the non-profit applicant, taking into account pertinent

information from the Grantee Compliance Database and the grant application. Project Officers are required to provide an assurance in the funding recommendation/funding package that the applicant possesses, or will possess, the necessary programmatic capability.

All competitive grant announcements, under which non-profit organizations can compete, must contain a programmatic capability ranking factor(s). Non-profit applicants and other applicants that compete will be evaluated under this factor. Non-profit applicants selected for funding will be subject to a review for administrative capability similar to that for non-competitive awards.

Project Officer Performance Standards

On November 14, 2004, EPA disseminated a memorandum entitled "Performance Standards for Grants Management." OSWER supports the requirement that project officers and their supervisors adequately address grants management responsibilities through the Agency's PERFORMS process. Headquarters and Regional offices are required to periodically re-evaluate the new standards as they conduct their grants management self-assessments.

OSWER has mandated the inclusion of factors that address grants management responsibilities in the performance standards of our Project Officers. Additionally, we continue to stress the importance of our managers discussing these factors/responsibilities during mid-year and annual performance appraisal meetings with the Project Officers.

Environmental Results of Grants and Link to *Strategic Plan*

On January 1, 2005, EPA issued the Environmental Results Order (5700.7). Under the Order, Program Offices are required to identify and link environmental results from proposed assistance agreements to the Agency's Strategic Plan/GPRA architecture. Further, the Order requires that the linkage to the Strategic Plan, as well as anticipated outputs and outcomes are identified and addressed in assistance agreement competitive funding announcements, work plans, and performance reports submitted to Grants Management Offices after January 1, 2005.

In compliance with the Environmental Results Order, OSWER requires that Project Officers identify the linkage to the Agency Strategic Plan, including goals, objectives, and sub-objectives, and anticipated outcomes and outputs in all competitive funding announcements, prior to obtaining AA certification. Additionally, OSWER has identified environmental results as a "key topic" area in reviewing and approving funding packages for award, prior to submission to GAD.

For consistency, OSWER, in collaboration with our regional and state partners, has developed new state grant templates for Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance, Brownfields and Underground Storage Tanks grant programs. The templates, mandated

by OMB, will be useful in identifying environmental results from OSWER categorical grant activities, and their linkage to the Agency's Strategic Plan/GPRA architecture.

The *2003-2008 EPA Strategic Plan* is available at
http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm.
Goal 3, 4 and 5 of the *Strategic Plan* present specific OSWER objectives, sub-objectives and strategic targets that define, in measurable terms, the change in public health or environmental conditions to be accomplished by 2008.

Links to Strategic Planning and Budgeting

For the purposes of strategic planning, and formulating and implementing annual budgets, program activities are represented by a planning architecture comprised of goals, objectives and supporting program/project activities. All major OSWER programs and their enforcement counterparts are represented in the *EPA FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification* (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2007/2007cj.htm) as follows:

Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration

- Objective 1; By 2008, reduce adverse effects to land by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and ensuring proper management of waste and petroleum products at facilities in ways that prevent releases.
  Program/Project Activities
  - Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance
  - Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks
  - Compliance Assistance and Centers
  - LUST / UST
  - RCRA: Waste Management
  - RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling

- Objective 2; By 2008, control the risks to human health and the environment by mitigating the impact of accidental or intentional releases and by cleaning up and restoring contaminated sites or properties to appropriate levels.
  Program/Project Activities
  - Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)
  - Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance
  - Civil Enforcement
  - Compliance Assistance and Centers
  - Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
  - Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure
  - LUST / UST
  - LUST Cooperative Agreements
  - Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response
  - RCRA: Corrective Action
  - Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal
  - Superfund: Enforcement
  - Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness
  - Superfund: Federal Facilities
  - Superfund: Remedial
  - Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies
  - Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement

- Objective 3; Through 2008, provide and apply sound science for protecting and restoring land by conducting leading-edge research and developing a better understanding and characterization of environmental outcomes under Goal 3.
  Program/Project Activities
  - Research: Land Protection and Restoration
  - Superfund: Remedial

Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

- Objective 1; Prevent and reduce pesticide, chemical, and genetically engineered biological organism risks to humans, communities, and ecosystems.
  Program/Project Activities
  - State and Local Prevention and Preparedness

- Objective 2; Sustain, clean up, and restore communities and the ecological systems that support them.
  Program/Project Activities
  - Brownfields
  - Brownfields Projects
  - Categorical Grant: Brownfields
  - Geographic Program: Other

Goal 5: Compliance and Environmental Stewardship

- Objective 2; By 2008, improve environmental protection and enhance natural resource conservation on the part of government, business, and the public through the adoption of pollution prevention and sustainable practices that include the design of products and manufacturing processes that generate less pollution, the reduction of regulatory barriers, and the adoption of results-based, innovative, and multimedia approaches.
  Program/Project Activities
  - RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling

Superfund Remedial and Federal Facilities Response Program Performance Measures

Goal	Obj.	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Number of Superfund final site assessment decisions	38,603	Final Assessment Decisions	419	350	315	284	
3	2	Superfund sites with human health protection achieved (exposure pathways are eliminated or potential exposures are under health-based levels for current use of land or water resources)	1,235	Sites	10	10	10	10	NPL sites only. Includes Superfund Federal facilities.
3	2	Superfund sites with groundwater migration under control	937	Sites	10	10	15	15	NPL sites only. Includes Superfund Federal facilities.
3	2	Number of final remedies selected at Superfund sites	1043	Final Remedies	20	20	20	20	NPL sites only. Includes Superfund Federal facilities.
3	2	Number of Superfund construction completions	966	Construction Completion	40	40	35	35	NPL sites only. Includes Superfund Federal facilities.
3	2	Sites Ready for Reuse	Under Develop-ment	Sites	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	

Goal	Obj.	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Percentage of Superfund spending that is obligated to individual sites each year	55%	Obligations	54.8	Discontinued			
3	2	Human exposures under control per million dollars	Under development	Dollars	No target	No target	No target	No target	
3	2	Amount of Superfund Federal Facility Response program spending per operable unit completing all planned remedial actions	$1,100K	Dollars	$1,000K	$960K	No target	No target	This measure was established in 2005 due to PART.
3	2	Number of Federal Facility Superfund sites where all remedies have completed construction	47	Sites	5	5	No target	No target	Targets for this measure are a component of the overall Superfund program targets, and were established as a result of PART.
3	2	Federal Facility Superfund sites with groundwater contamination under control (exposure pathways eliminated or potential exposures under health-based levels for current use of land/water resources	89	Sites	1	1	No target	No target	Targets for this measure are a component of the overall Superfund program targets, and were established as a result of PART.

Goal	Obj.	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Number of Federal Facility Superfund sites where the final remedial decision for contaminants at the site has been determined	61	Remedies	5	6	No target	No target	Targets for this measure are a component of the overall Superfund program targets, and were established as a result of PART.
3	2	Federal Facility Superfund sites with human exposures under control (exposure pathways are eliminated or potential exposures are under health-based levels for current use of land or water resources).	134	Sites	129	132	No target	No target	Targets for this measure are a component of the overall Superfund program targets, and were established as a result of PART.
3	2	Superfund Federal Facility sites where remedies evaluated through a required Five-Year Review are found to be protective of human health and the environment, or actions are underway to ensure protectiveness.*		Sites	N/A	90%	90%	90%	
3	2	Percent of Settlements or Enforcement Actions before the Start of the Remedial Action		Settlements or Enforcement Actions	95 %	95 %	95 %	95 %	

Goal	Obj.	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Statute of Limitations Cases with Unaddressed Total Past Costs Equal to or Greater than $200,000		Statute of Limitations Cases	100%	100 %	100 %	100 %	

Notes: Baseline year is FY2005; All Federal Facility Superfund measures concern NPL sites only.

* Effective pending release of the final 2006-2011 Strategic Plan architecture on September 30, 2006.

Emergency Response and Prevention Program Performance Measures

Goal	Obj.	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Percentage improvement in emergency response and homeland security readiness (Beginning in FY06, changed to achieve and maintain at least 95% of maximum score on readiness evaluation criteria in each Region.)	completed in FY 2003	percentage improvement	Achieve 95% readiness	Achieve 95% readiness	Maintain 95% readiness		
3	2	Number of oil spills responded to or monitored (Delete after FY06 due to new PART measures.)	3,288	spill responses	300	300			
3	2	Number of Superfund-lead removal actions completed.	Baseline starts at 0	removal actions	195	195	195	195	
3	2	Number of voluntary removal actions, overseen by EPA and completed.	Baseline starts at 0	voluntary Removal actions	115	120	125	130	
3	2	Percentage compliance rate of inspected facilities subject to the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) regulations.	100%	percentage compliance	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Goal	Obj.	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Percentage compliance rate of inspected facilities subject to the Federal Response Plan (FRP) regulations.	100%	percentage compliance	100%	100%	100%	100%	
4	1	Number of risk management plan audits completed.	N/A	facilities	400	400	400		
4	1	Percentage of LEPCs which have incorporated RMP information into their emergency plans.	FY2005	LEPCs and/or communities	N/A	N/A	N/A		Will determine future targets based on baseline data collected in 2005.

Note: Baseline year is FY2005.

Brownfields Cleanup and Redevelopment Program Performance Measures

Goal	Obj	Measure	FY 05 Baseline (3rd Quarter data)	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
4	2	Brownfields properties assessed.	740	1,000	1,000			
4	2	Number of Brownfields cleanup grants awarded.	89	25	No Target			
4	2	Number of properties cleaned up using Brownfields funding.	23	60	60			
4	2	Acres of Brownfields property made ready for reuse.		No target	No target			
4	2	Number of jobs generated from Brownfields activities.	2,912	5,000	5,000			
4	2	Number of Brownfields job training participants trained.	233	200	200			
4	2	Percentage of Brownfields job training trainees placed.	61%	65%	65%			
4	2	Number of Tribes supported by Brownfields cooperative agreements.	7	no target	No target			
4	2	Billions of dollars of cleanup and redevelopment funds leveraged at Brownfields sites.	$0.3 B	$0.9B	$0.9B			

Performance information will be extracted from grantee quarterly reports and entered into the national Brownfields Management System (BMS) database. Reporting requirements are included in the grant terms and conditions. Assessment, Cleanup, and Revolving Loan Fund Grantees are required to complete the property profile form. Job Training Grantees are required to complete the job training reporting form. EPA Regions are required to complete the grant profile forms. State and Tribal Section 128 (a) reporting will be based on the terms and conditions of the grant. More information on Brownfields Information and Data is available on the intranet at: http://intranet.epa.gov/swerbrnf/bf_info.htm.

RCRA Waste Management Program Performance Measures

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comments
3	1	Millions of tons of municipal solid waste diverted from landfilling.*	72.3 (FY03)	Tons	83.1	85.2	TBD	TBD	
3	1	Daily per capita generation of municipal solid waste.	4.4 (FY 03)	Pounds	4.5	4.5	TBD	TBD	
3	1	Percent of MSW generated that is recycled.	31%	Pounds	TBD	TBD	35%	TBD	
3	1	Percent of construction and demolition waste that is reused or recycled.*	TBD	Tons	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	
3	1	Percent of coal combustion products that is recycled.*	40%	Tons	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	
3	1	Pounds of electronics waste that is safely recycled as a result of the Plug-In program.	TBD	Pounds	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	Internal goal

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comments
3	1	Pounds of electronics waste safely recycled as a result of the Federal Electronics Challenge (FEC)	TBD	Pounds	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	Internal goal
3	1	Additional federal organizations participating in the FEC program resulting from EPA efforts	TBD	Federal Organizations	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	Internal goal
3	1	Percent of RCRA hazardous waste facilities with permits or other approved controls in place	87%	Facilities	2.5% of universe	2.4% of universe	TBD	TBD	
3	1	Update controls for preventing releases at facilities due for permit renewal by 2006	0	Facilities	50	50	50	TBD	
3	1	Number of Tribes covered by an integrated waste management plan approved by an appropriate governing body	0	Tribes	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comments
3	1	Number of open dumps in Indian country and other Tribal lands that are closed, cleaned up, or upgraded	0	Dumps	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	Data is from IHS Sanitation Deficiency System (SAS) Operations and Maintenance Data System (OMDS), as revised
3	2	Percent of RCRA hazardous waste facilities with migration of contaminated groundwater under control (CA750)	68%	Facilities	68%	76%	80%	TBD	
3	2	Percent of RCRA hazardous waste facilities assessed (CA075)	99%	Facilities	98%	100%	100%	TBD	
3	2	Percent of RCRA hazardous waste facilities with final remedies selected (CA400)	20%	Facilities	21%	26%	30%	TBD	

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comments
3	2	Percent of RCRA hazardous waste facilities with remedy construction completed (CA550)	13%	Facilities	13%	17%	20%	TBD	
5	2	Percent reduction of priority chemicals in waste streams	TBD	Pounds	1.2 million	0.6 million (assumes that the 1.2 million pound targets for 05 and 06 have been met)	0.6 million (assumes that the targets for 05, 06 and 07 have been met)	TBD	2005 goal revised to 1.2 million pounds priority chemical reduction. Reporting on this goal involves a 2 year data lag. Actual reductions for 2007 will be available in 2009. Actual goal achievement (reductions achieved by 2008) will be available in 2010.

* Effective pending release of the final 2006-2011 Strategic Plan architecture on September 30, 2006.

Underground Storage Tanks Program Performance and Efficiency Measures

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	1	Percent increase of UST facilities that are in significant operational compliance with both release detection and release prevention (spill, overfill, and corrosion protection requirements). [APG/APM: ST6]	66%	%	+1%	+1%	+1%	+1%	At the end of FY 2005, a total of 66% of the estimated universe of approximately 246,650 facilities were in significant operational compliance with both release detection and release prevention (spill, overfill, and corrosion protection) requirements.
3	1	Number of confirmed UST releases nationally.). [APG/APM: ST1]	7,421 confirmed releases in FY 2005	UST Releases	<10,000	<10,000	<10,000	<10,000	Baseline: Between FY 1999 and FY 2005, confirmed UST releases averaged 10,844, and the annual number of confirmed releases in FY 2005 was 7,421.

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Number of cleanups that meet state risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration (tracked as number of LUST cleanups completed). **PART**. [APG/APM: 108]	14,583 cleanups completed in FY 2005	Cleanups	13,600	13,000	13,000	13,000	At the end of FY 2005, EPA completed 332,799 leaking underground storage tank cleanups.
3	2	Comparison of LUST cleanups completed over a 3-year rolling average with public and private sector cleanup costs**. PART**. [APG/APM: 109]	Baseline Development	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
3	2	Number of acres of land available for reuse or in continued use at leaking underground storage tank sites. [APG/APM: 114]	14,583	Cleanups	13,600	13,000	13,000	13,000	

Goal	Obj	Measure	Baseline	Unit of Measure	FY 06 Enacted National Target	FY 07 Draft National Target	FY 08 Draft National Target	FY 09 Draft National Target	Comment
3	2	Number of cleanups that meet risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration in Indian country. [APG/APM: 113]	(51 cleanups completed in Indian Country in FY 2005)	Cleanups	30	30	30	30	At the end of FY 2005, 677 leaking underground storage tank cleanups were completed in Indian Country.

Categorical Grant:								
ACS Code	**Outcome / Output Measure**	**200x National Baseline**	**200x National Target**	**200x State Baseline**	**200x State Measurement**	**Measure-ment Period or date**	**Source of Data**	**Comments**
Goal : Goal 3 Land Preservation and Restoration								
Objective : Obj 1 By 2008, Reduce adverse effects to land by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and ensuring proper management of waste and petroleum products at facilities in ways that prevent releases.								
Subobjective Subobj 2 Manage hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly. (By 2008, reduce releases to the environment by managing hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly.								
Strategic Targets								
FY 2006 ACS Code HW3	By the end of 2008, prevent releases from RCRA hazardous waste management facilities by increasing the number of facilities with permits or other approved controls from 79% at the end of FY 2002 to 95%.						RCRAInfo	
Program Measures								

Categorical Grant:								
ACS Code	**Outcome / Output Measure**	**200x National Baseline**	**200x National Target**	**200x State Baseline**	**200x State Measurement**	**Measure-ment Period or date**	**Source of Data**	**Comments**
Goal : Goal 3 Land Preservation and Restoration								
Objective : Obj 2 Restore Land: By 2008, Control the risks to human health and the environment by mitigating the impact of accidental or intentional releases and by cleaning up and restoring contaminated sites or properties to appropriate levels.								
Subobjective Subobj 2 Cleanup and Reuse Contaminated Land: By 2008, control the risks to human health and the environment ar contaminated properties or sites through cleanup, stabilitzation, or other action, and make land available for reuse.								
Strategic Targets								
FY 2006 ACS Code CA1	By 2008, control all identified unacceptable human exposures from site contamination to, at or below health-based levels for current land and/or groundwater use conditions at 95% of RCRA baseline facilities						RCRAInfo	
FY 2006 ACS Code CA5	By 2008, complete construction of remedies at RCRA baseline facilities.						RCRAInfo	
Program Measures								

Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems								
Objective 2: Sustain, cleanup, and restore communities and the ecological systems that support them.								
Subobjective 3: Assess and Cleanup Brownfields: By 2008, provide funding to eligible grant recipients, and, working with our state and tribal partners, assess and promote the cleanup and reuse of 9,200 brownfields properties, leveraging 33,700 jobs and $10.2 billion in cleanup/redevelopment funding.								
Strategic Targets								
FY 2006 ACS Code B29	Number of properties assessed. (language of measure contained in subobjective)						1. State quarterly or semi-annual reports and EPA Regions then submit a "Property Profile Form (PPF)" or 2. the state voluntarily submits a PPF directly.	
FY 2006 ACS Code B32	NOT IN CURRENT STRATEGIC PLAN BUT IS PROPOSED FOR NEW STRATEGIC PLAN: Number of properties cleaned up.						1. State quarterly or semi-annual reports and EPA Regions then submit a "Property Profile Form (PPF)" or 2. the state voluntarily submits a PPF directly.	

Categorical Grant:								
ACS Code	**Outcome / Output Measure**	**200x National Baseline**	**200x National Target**	**200x State Baseline**	**200x State Measurement**	**Measure-ment Period or date**	**Source of Data**	**Comments**
Goal : Goal 3 Land Preservation and Restoration								
Objective : Obj 1 By 2008, Reduce adverse effects to land by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and ensuring proper management of waste and petroleum products at facilities in ways that prevent releases.								
Subobjective Subobj 2 Manage hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly. (By 2008, reduce releases to the environment by managing hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly.								
Strategic Targets								
FY 2006 ACS Code ST6	By 2008, increase the percentage of UST facilities that are in significant operational compliance with both release detection and release prevention by 4% compared to 2004, out of a total estimated universe of approximately 263,000 facilities.						States submit the data to the Regional offices semi-annually	
Program Measures								